

## The Sun

SATURDAY, JUNE 12, 1897.

Subscriptions by Mail Post-Paid.

DAILY, per Month	50 Cts.
DAILY, per Year	5 00
SUNDAY, per Year	1 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year	6 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month	50 Cts.

Postage to foreign countries added.

The Sun, New York City.

Printed—Kingside No. 19, near Grand Hotel.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

## Stop the Nonsense.

Since the Dingley bill has been under discussion in the Senate, Democratic Senators have been voting for protection. Intended and undisguised. Democrats have themselves proposed new protective duties, the most striking being the duty of 20 per cent. upon cotton, recommended by the Hon. AUGUSTUS O. BACON of Georgia. Yet this proposition was less sensational than the vote upon it. In a Senate in which there are thirty-two Democrats, the vote in opposition to the cotton duty was only 19, the number favoring it being 42.

To those who have watched the course of the Democrats since Congress assembled in December, 1893, to perform the tariff promise of 1892, the recent proceedings in the Senate have been about as natural as sunrise. Some other people, principally the old CLEVELAND Cuckoo crowd, have made them the occasion or the opportunity for surprise and indignation. They denounce or they mourn as a new decadence this abandonment of the once Democratic principle that the tariff must be for revenue only. For example, the Commercial Appeal of Memphis says that the Democrats are "changing front"; that "the poison seems to have infected a good many of those once staunch, and caused them to desert the old standard and change front on a dominant Democratic principle." The Baltimore Sun, the most unquenchable Cuckoo of all, thinks it sees among the Democrats in the Senate "the open spectacle of a radical division upon the question of a tariff as to principles which the party has always heretofore deemed vital and fundamental." In the Senate itself Mr. CANNON of Louisiana and Mr. MILLS of Texas are lashing their colleagues as traitors to a first principle of Democracy.

This state of mind is humbug. Whatever the abstract conviction of the complaining parties may be, the indignation now visited upon certain Democrats who are acting with the majority in the Senate is pure hypocrisy. The protests of the alleged revenue-only men are just four years too late for them to be entitled to respect. The evidence that this is true is as simple and as clear as the Democratic tariff plank of 1892. It consists in the fact that, from the day when the tariff bill of that year was laid before the House of Representatives by GROVER CLEVELAND and WILLIAM L. WILSON, framed upon no economic principle whatsoever, and, least of all on the principle of the Democratic platform, capricious, and, on the authority of Mr. WILSON's own mouth, for protection, down to the day when the bill left the hands of Congress to be signed by the President, not a single newspaper of this Cuckoo crowd and not a single member of Congress, either of those still in or of those that have been left out, ever said a word of protest that the bill was not for revenue only, or ever offered a bill honestly for that purpose in its place. The revenue-only principle was abandoned then by every newspaper now using it as a badge for the Democrats who don't stand by it, and by every Democrat now spreading it over the record of the Senate debates. The rumpus raised by its present champions is a cover for their betrayal of it four years ago, like the "perfidy and dishonor" phrase which President CLEVELAND flourished before Congress as a cover for his own.

A revision of the tariff which shall abolish the deficit in the Federal revenue and end commercial uncertainty is much too important for more time to be wasted now than essays upon a theory long ago discarded, and with pharisaic reviling of Democrats who know that a tariff for revenue only is not their party's principle and who are sincere enough to say so.

## A Curious Notion

The Staats-Zeitung, Herr OTTENDORF's German newspaper, declares with heat that our German born and descended citizens will not support Mr. SEITH Low nor any other man as a candidate for Mayor unless they know how he stands upon the enforcement of the Raines law. "Who can tell," it asks, "what would be the state of things with regard to the enforcement of the Raines law after the election, unless unmistakably binding guarantees were given that the first Mayor of Greater New York would distinguish himself by liberality in this respect?"

Such a view of the relation which an executive officer bears to the laws and their enforcement reveals a curious distinction observable only among naturalized German-Americans following the Staats-Zeitung. A Mayor of New York, whether the present or the enlarged New York, is a sworn public official. Before he enters office, he takes, as the law prescribes, an oath to observe and aid in enforcing the laws, not merely the laws which meet his personal views, suit his personal prejudices, or which he considers advisable, but all the laws of the State of New York, unconditionally and absolutely. The oath which a Mayor-elect of New York takes, standing with head bowed and hand raised, is prescribed in the last chapter of New York (section 3, Article III), and taking it he swears to be "vigilant and active in causing the laws of the State to be executed and enforced."

Now Herr OTTENDORF demands that he qualify this oath with the declaration that he is under "unmistakably binding guarantees" not to enforce some of the laws of the State as to the sale of lager beer and whiskey at retail, except with "liberality." A Mayor of New York is elected to uphold the lawful authority of the State and to aid in enforcing the laws adopted by the Legislature. He is not a judge of the wisdom or propriety of the laws. His duty and his business are to assist in the enforcement of the laws and not in adding or abetting their violation. The theory of Herr OTTENDORF seems to be that laws in this State are of two classes, and that the law relating to beer selling is to be enforced or disregarded as local officials prefer, while all other laws must be enforced unconditionally. Herr OTTENDORF must have his beer,

law or no law. He demands that the law shall be disregarded for his benefit when he wants a glass of lager. Because a law interferes with his drinking, he requires that an officer sworn to enforce the law shall violate his oath by not enforcing it. This curious notion Herr OTTENDORF seems to entertain in common with those German citizens who agitate the atmosphere of lager-beer gardens with complaints of the Raines law and the fidelity of the sworn officers of the State in enforcing it. They are all orderly, law-abiding, and worthy citizens, except when it comes to a question of beer, and then they change. They think that in a matter of such supreme consequence as beer drinking private individuals have a reserved right to demand that the officers of the law should put at defiance any law which interferes with the appetite for lager.

If it were to be pretended by anybody that a candidate for the office of Mayor of New York would be justified in giving "unmistakably binding guarantees" in advance of election that he would disregard in office some of the laws as to the Board of Health, for instance, and the regulations adopted by it to preserve the sanitary interests of the city, there would be a loud outcry, the Mayor would be compelled to disregard the "unmistakably binding guarantees," or by orderly process of law be impeached and turned out of his place.

What warrant of law, what rule of action, what color of claim or usage, what sound and defensible excuse has Herr OTTENDORF in calling upon a candidate to forswear himself in the interest of lager-beer drinkers peculiarly? What man is there to be found in New York who will sustain this riotous German editor? In Herr OTTENDORF's view, the larger-beer question will be "the pivot around which the campaign will turn." More properly it would be described as a spigot around which the campaign will turn. Candidates are admonished to keep their eyes upon the spigot or pivot if any hope of success exists among them. The anarchistic Herr OTTENDORF is determined to vote for no candidate who will not violate the law in order to let him have lager. There is only one great and momentous public question for him; and it is the larger question.

## Bad Politics in Kentucky.

The so-called National Democracy, which was differentiated from the regular National Democracy at Indianapolis last year and east about 132,000 votes in November, against over 6,500,000 polled for BRYAN, has something of an organization in Kentucky, which has now issued a call for a State Convention, to be held at Louisville next month, for the nomination of a candidate for Clerk of the Court of Appeals.

The tone, spirit, and character of this call are expressed in the extract below: "We appeal to all Democrats to unite with us who believe, as we do, in sound money, in a tariff for revenue only; in the honest and full payment of all lawful obligations; in law and order; and in the protection of property from lawlessness and riot; in the rejection of all forms of socialism, of anarchy, and of all other forms of lawlessness and crime against each other and in the protection of the same and credit of the commonwealth."

It will be seen that the purposes announced are general and not specific as regards the currency issue. To demand "sound money" merely is to beg the question. What is sound money? That is the question which is the great political issue of this time. The Democracy of the Chicago platform, the regular Democracy, say it is unlimited silver, coined free, at the ratio of 16 to 1. At least, that is sound enough money for them. But the platform of the Indianapolis Convention of the National Democrats who have sent out this Kentucky call, "insists upon the maintenance of the gold standard and of the parity therewith of every dollar issued by the Government," and declares firm opposition to "the free and unlimited coinage of silver." Why, then, do they not call from which we have quoted before "sound money" as the single gold standard? Then the National Democrats of Kentucky would have had a clear definition, and everybody would have known exactly where they stand.

But in another plank the Indianapolis platform itself confused the subject of "currency reform" by this declaration: "We denounce also the further maintenance of the present patchwork system of national paper currency as a constant source of injury and peril. We assert the necessity of such intelligent currency reform as will confine the Government to its functions, completely separated from the banking business, and afford to all sections of our country a uniform, safe, and elastic bank currency under governmental supervision, measured in volume by the needs of business."

The issue of circulating notes not being banking business, but only an exercise upon it, the Government is not now in that business; but so far as this plank is concerned, it means that the whole business of issuing circulating notes should be taken away from the Government and given to the banks alone. As bank currency, however, is to be "under governmental supervision," how is the Government to be "completely separated from the banking business" by the adoption of the Indianapolis proposition?

If the Government is to go out of the business of issuing circulating notes, and the exercise of the function is to be turned over to the banks solely and for their exclusive benefit, the greenbacks and the Treasury notes must be retired and bonds issued, on which the bank currency shall be based, or else the "elastic currency" allowed will be a wild-cat currency purely. The banks would be sure winners under such a plan; but who else would gain any profit from it? Are the people so much in love with the banks that they would make a sacrifice of \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 a year for their benefit? The proposition would not get even serious consideration in Congress, and when the consequences involved in it were understood by the people they would reject it almost unanimously, and with contempt. It is a device to substitute unsound money for sound, and for the benefit of the banks and nothing else.

What is the use, then, of any political faction undertaking to found a platform on such a rotten plank?

Moreover, the call of the Kentucky National Democrats asserts their belief "in a tariff for revenue only." The platform of the Democratic party adopted in 1892 made the same declaration in still stronger and more precise terms. It declared it "to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only." But as it proceeded, when put in power, to levy tariff duties for protection distinctively, and sedulously avoided the imposition of purely revenue duties, on tea and coffee, for instance, and, instead, got up an unconstitutional income tax in defiance of "a fundamental principle of the Democratic party," no more Democratic assertions

of belief "in a tariff for revenue only" will be taken seriously by anybody. It is a waste of breath to make them; a confession of past perfidy, serving only to bring the party into further contempt. Moreover, Democratic Senators are now openly voting for protection simply as protection. "Tariff for revenue only" is moonshine. It is a declaration of humbug. The people cannot be deceived and swindled again. With that cry the Democratic party won the election in 1892, with the consequence of the protective Wilson tariff, productive of an enormous deficit, rendering necessary a great increase in the bonded debt of the Government, and causing unprecedented business and industrial disaster. It will be long before the American people forget those four dismal years and the cause of the ruin and suffering they brought. It will be long before Democrats forget the defeat and the disruption which came upon their party as a consequence of that perfidy.

The tariff, however, fortunately for the Democracy, has disappeared, for the time being, at least, as an actual issue of politics, and the issues of the Chicago platform, of which the tariff is not one, have replaced it. Can the National Democracy of Indianapolis make any respectable resistance to the regular National Democracy of the Chicago platform in Kentucky or anywhere else with such evasion, generality, and inconsistency as we have quoted? The Bryanite Democracy has a definite plan of "currency reform"—free coinage of silver at 16 to 1. What is the plan the Indianapolis Democrats have to oppose to it? There is none which it dares put out in other than a general way. Do they expect to beat silver with the retirement of the greenbacks and the Treasury notes and the issue of bonds, or by the substitution of a wild-cat currency? They must get some definite principles before they can hope to make a better showing than they did last year when they polled in the Union only about as many votes as the Protectionists, and in Kentucky itself only about 5,000 out of a total in the State of more than 445,000. As it is, they have not a leg of principle to stand on; they are firing into the air, and very small shot at that. Worse still, they are bringing Democracy into ridicule, and delaying the day of resurrection which will come for the Democratic party after it has discharged its first and imperative duty of beating the spurious Democracy of the Chicago platform by uniting with its enemies of whatever party name to accomplish the destruction. Recovery for the Democracy is impossible until that job is finished.

**Tammany and "Local Issues."**—Mr. FRANK CAMPBELL, the New York member of the Popocratic National Committee, says, what everybody knows, that the Chicago platform "will stand unaltered" until 1900. Still, "if the Democrats of the city of New York, Buffalo, or Rochester deem it expedient and wise for party success to conduct their local elections without injecting into them State or national issues," he believes that "they have a right to do so without interference of any State national committee." Excellent Mr. CAMPBELL, who now takes the cat out of the bag and the pig out of the poke:

"Democrats living in the State outside of the city of New York are looking anxiously for the election of a Democratic Mayor for Greater New York. If this could be accomplished, it would encourage the rank and file of the party, and enable the organization to get into fighting shape for the important State election that is to take place next year from this fall, when the Governor, State Officers, and the Legislature are to be elected."

"If we carry Greater New York and elect these officers next year, then the party will be in shape, for the first time since 1892, to carry the New York State in the Democratic column in 1900."

In plainer words, if Bryanism, assisted ignorantly by the Citizens' Union gulls, can get control of this city by false pretences, by bamboozling the voters with local issues, the Bryanites will be greatly strengthened in their preparations for the elections of 1898 and 1900.

The Bryanite game is to sneak into power by hiding the issues and its own purposes. Once in power, it would use it for the benefit of the dangerous and dishonest principles which the city and State of New York rejected in 1896.

## Proposed Socialistic Legislation in England.

Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, having gained no laurels from the mock investigation of the South Africa Company's connection with the Jameson raid, and having apparently renounced the hope of an imperial coronation, is claiming upon another way of bringing his claims to political leadership before the British electors. He has stepped outside of the functions pertaining to the Secretary for the Colonies, and has invaded the province of the Home Secretary by a bill, of which Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY is the ostensible introducer, but of which Mr. CHAMBERLAIN is the author and chief champion.

The bill provides that workmen in certain specified trades shall receive compensation from their employers for injuries incurred in the course of their labors, and it has been received with delight by the intended beneficiaries because it goes further than any law dealing with the subject which has been enacted thus far by any legislature in the world. Measures similar in scope have been put forward in France and Belgium, but have never been passed; one of these, for instance, has been pending for eight years in the French Chamber of Deputies. It is true that in Germany one of the three experiments in State socialism made by BISMARCK assures a certain amount of compensation to workmen, when accidents befall them. The law, however, simply provides that for the first thirteen weeks after a mishap, a workman shall be supported by a fund, to which he himself has contributed one-half. Notwithstanding this precaution, the critics of the German statute assert that a great deal of malingering takes place. Hitherto in England, a workman, when hurt in the prosecution of his calling, could rely on a certain amount of help, provided he was a member of one of the so-called Friendly Societies; the shamming of sickness or of incapacity, however, was scarcely possible, because he was incessantly watched by his fellow workmen, under Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's bill, on the other hand, malingering will be practically unrestrained, for the whole burden of supporting the workman during convalescence is to fall on the employer.

So far as the House of Commons is concerned, the bill seems certain to become a law. It has already passed the second reading without a division. Resistance to it was offered by some of the employers of labor who are members of Parliament, but the Conservatives, as a body, gave a silent

and sullen assent to the scheme advocated by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, whom they secretly regard with deep distrust, while the Liberals, disgusted to find the wind taken out of their sails, could only protest that the proposal, although exemplary in its way, did not go far enough. They said that a law providing that employers should compensate workmen for injuries incurred while at work should be made applicable to all trades instead of only to a few. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN retorted that sound legislation was seldom logical, but proceeded one step at a time. The aim of the bill before the House, he explained, was to afford compensation for injuries in trades especially dangerous, and also in those where the proposed law would not impose an unreasonable load upon small employers. Another objection was made by overcautious Liberals, who evidently were trying to outbid Mr. CHAMBERLAIN for the suffrage of workmen, namely, that a bill adequately dealing with the subject would provide for the prevention of accidents, as well as for the compensation of those who should suffer from them. To which, with a sarcastic smile, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN responded: "All in good time" and suggested that human nature, being strongly developed in employers, would probably cause them to take effective precautions against accidents, the moment they found they would have to bear the whole burden of compensating for them.

On the whole, it is manifest that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN has out the ground under the feet of the Gladstonian Liberals, who have been drifting toward State socialism for some years. In the House of Commons, as we have said, the Conservatives seem afraid to balk their dangerous ally, but it does not appear that they will not be expelled in the House of Lords where the members of the Salisbury clique, who eye him with ill-disguised aversion, are all-powerful.

## Four New Dances.

The Convention of Dancing Masters has been in session in this town this week, and the order, harmony, and rhythm of its proceedings must have filled with envy every student of parliament law and master of the gavel. Even TOM REED himself, with his all-conquering ruses and rulings, lacks the poetry, the grace, the waving ease of these professors of deportment in solemn meetings assembled. They use the head as well as the toes.

For the delectation of the toes, however, the professors have invented four new dances, the names of which it is our privilege to communicate to the public. The Citizens' Union Galliard is performed in double quick time by 250 or less dancers standing on their heads, at the same time clapping their hands together, kicking in unison, and chanting "No PLATT! No PLATT!" Music: A cracked organ with a dive for a monkey. The Goo Goo Saraband is hopped in a maniacal manner on stilts, the performers, young men preferred, from time to time casting appealing looks to heaven, and at other times regarding themselves with an expression of deep satisfaction. The walls and floor of the room in which this dance is given must be of plate glass. Music: Zöllan harps, and snaredrums made of the skin of the Mugwump bird, playing the inspiring old refrain:

"O, pity, pity, pity!

This is such a wicked city.

Such a foul and stagnant city, full of stinks, stains, stains!

But we Goo Goo, we will save it,

Cleanse and purify and leave it,

And only ask to toss it for our palms, palms, palms!

The Garro Tammany consists of a panel of jurymen dressed in skins of Holstein cattle, and with clasped hands moving with incredible velocity around a wooden figure full of whisks, in the center. This dance is a modification of "Pull in the Ring," except that the floor is carpeted with three-ply dialect, and by means of an ingenious invisible machine, the central figure explodes itself every three minutes, at once picks itself together and is again discomposed. When it is not exploding, the dancers, all of whom smoke explosive cigars, something like a Roman candle, detonate into a thousand fragments, pick themselves up and resume the ring. Music: A porcelain-lined beer fountain playing "Der Chail Is Out." A novel dance, of most pleasing effect.

The fourth number is the Tammany Sneak. The figures are muffled in blanket ballots, wear rubber-soled shoes or silver clogs, and hold umbrellas before their faces. They shuffle over the stage in the usual manner of stage conspirators, and once in a while flash dark lanterns on a transparency "Local issues only!" When they reach a corner of the stage they throw off the blankets, appear in complete suits of silver mail, and execute an Anarchist breakdown. Air: "A Bunco Game Is My Heart's Delight." Instrument, a buffalo horn.

This is a great year for dancing, but the piper has yet to be paid.

## The Situation at Constantinople.

The cablegram from our London correspondent published in yesterday's SUN describing the interview between the British Ambassador and the Turkish Foreign Minister, at Constantinople, had dramatic force as well as high political importance. The presence of the Russian Ambassador at the moment when the British Ambassador made his declaration that the refusal to evacuate Thessaly would involve the withdrawal of England from the European concert, admits of two interpretations; either the declaration was addressed to both the Ottoman Foreign Minister and the Russian Ambassador, or the latter was already cognizant of what was about to take place. Whichever interpretation proves to be the right one, the fact that the British Government is prepared to resume its freedom of action cannot fail to exercise a powerful influence on the ultimate decision of the powers regarding Greece.

The triumph of the policy of which the Turk has been the tool, means the extinction of Greece as an independent State, which would be to the manifest disadvantage of the western powers—that is, of the three maritime States, England, France, and Italy. The disappearance of Greece as a nationality would in all probability be followed at no distant date by that of the other Balkan and Danubian States, and that would constitute a serious disturbance of the balance of power in Europe to the still greater disadvantage of the maritime powers. How far, then, the British Ambassador's declaration to TEWKIF Pasha, in the presence of the Russian Ambassador, will be effectual remains to be seen. The increased war preparations by Turkey reported since the 22d of May, the date of the declaration, may mean much or nothing, for it is the habit of the Turk to make the greatest show of resistance just before yielding, in order to test his opponent. It may be, however, that, pushed by his

backers in the concert, he intends to stand firm; in which case the situation becomes serious. Still, as some time has now elapsed since the declaration was made without any action being taken in the direction indicated by it, it may be assumed that Lord SALISBURY does not consider the moment to have arrived when it would be expedient to withdraw from the concert. The date for the celebration of the Queen's jubilee festival is now close at hand, and only very urgent reasons would be allowed to interfere with it; in the ordinary course of events, therefore, nothing very startling need be looked for before that event has passed. Meanwhile the Italian, Russian, and English agents sent to Thessaly to report upon that province will have had time to make their examination, and Greece and the dispossessed villagers of the occupied territory will have to worry along the best way they can. The situation also will have an opportunity to develop itself to the point of compelling more active efforts to bring about a solution of the difficulty that grow every day more dangerous for the peace of Europe. The antagonisms of interest between several of the powers, of which we have had glimpses from time to time, will tend to become more irreconcilable with every day's delay, and if a sincere desire for peace really does exist among all the members of the concert, they cannot demonstrate it better than by showing their determination to adhere to their own declaration, made just before the war broke out, that neither side should be allowed to profit by it territorially. If Europe remains divided, the Turk continues to control the situation as before, under advice.

As to the Sultan's nomination of a deputa-tion to proceed to London to take part in the jubilee celebrations, the reasons that have decided him on doing so, under the circumstances, can only be described as eminently Turkish.

## Japan's Dispute with Hawaii.

Although the report has been current that Japan contemplated reinforcing the cruiser Nanika, at Honolulu, with two other war vessels, the latest news from the Hawaiian capital indicates a peaceful settlement of the immigration trouble.

While no positive agreement had been reached at the latest tidings by Minister COOPER and Mr. SHIWAMURA, yet it has been said that the agreement will be probably on the basis of a reasonable indemnity for any cases in which immigrants were turned back in palpable violation of Hawaiian law.

Such a compromise would, at all events, relieve Hawaii from a demand for 320 yen, or any other sum, as damages for every Japanese immigrant who was not allowed to land. On the other hand, since it is admitted that, among the cases of immigrants examined, mistaken decisions may have been made, in such cases Hawaii is responsible and must pay proper damages.

While there may be some optimism in this view of the probable basis of settlement, at least it is more rational than the astonishing Vancouver conjecture that Japan is prepared, if President DOLE rejects her demand, either to take her 30,000 people away from the islands, leaving the plantations to suffer, or else to land forces from her warships and seize the Custom House at Honolulu, paying herself out of the receipts. How Japan would mend matters by abrogating private contracts in the former case, and going to a great expense for transportation, or what she would expect the United States to do in the latter case, remains a mystery to be solved.

It is true that the Hawaii must and doubtless will stand by that right to regulate immigration which all countries possess. On the other hand, she must also concede the binding force of treaties until abrogated. With these principles clearly in view it should not be very difficult to reach a just settlement based on the exact facts in each case.

## The Cavernous Reservoir of a Populist Chief Justice.

The Hon. FRANK DOSTER is a Populist of much frankness and enthusiasm. Even before he was elected Chief Justice of Kansas he had made himself famous by declaring that the rights of the occupier of property are superior to those of the owner. In declaring an opinion last week in a case which involved the powers of an investigating committee of the Legislature to make witnesses questioned by it answer, Judge DOSTER spoke contemptuously of "Government by injunction and government by habeas corpus and government by the courts," forms of inquiry which, he said, "are rapidly passing into accepted theories of municipal sovereignty." The "virus" of these theories "has so inoculated the body politic as to endanger the very life of the organized political system." Then Judge DOSTER mentioned the fact that even in Kansas "only four years ago a majority of the Judges of this court assumed the right to compose a legislative dispute as to one of the houses, and this not upon any theory of constitutional interpretation, but by the might of forces drawn out of that vast and cavernous reservoir of authority called judicial power."

The danger that the courts may check the activity of crank Legislatures engaged in regulating things in general without regard to the Constitution, common sense, or common justice, must seem very serious to the Populist. Judge DOSTER, however, has a Populist Supreme Court, and no undue interference with the energies of the Legislature will be permitted. Yet as long as "that vast and cavernous reservoir of authority called judicial power" can be drawn upon by courts, which are not under Populist control, Populist statesmen cannot be sure that they will not be drowned by the outflow. Law and Populist-made laws must be irreconcilable opposites. Would it not be better to seal up the vast and cavernous reservoir? Legislative power is the one necessary and final power. Why then have courts, which are often impudently careless of the holy zeal of Legislatures, to reform the world? Why not shut up the courts for good?

Millions of dollars were said to be waiting on the shelves of the institution for the use of the candidate for Postmaster at that place, was in town to-day.

Some of them are being invested; some of them are waiting for the passage of the Tariff bill; and more are still too timid to risk enterprise while the Bryanite connection is haunting for wealth like tigers with vultures that they will have it for their own.

What is the issue which will prevent this party division? That of simple good government. The candidate who shall stand for that issue, the issue that he can be neither misunderstood nor misinterpreted is the only one who can hope to win against Tammany.—Bretnig News.

Of course it will be the issue, dear boy. It is the issue of every election and the only issue, whether the election be municipal, State, or Federal, here or anywhere else. The divisions of politics are made solely by differences of opinion as to what "good government" is.

From the Salvation.

From the Salvation.

From the Salvation.

Every candidate at the coming municipal election will appeal for votes on the ground that he is for "good government," and for Goo Goo to attempt to monopolize that cry is mere childishness. Even the Bryanite vote for Bryan as "good government." They will not vote for it as bad government. But the same, conservative, and truly civilized citizens of New York will vote against it as fatal to all sound government and the safeguards of civilized society. These Mugwumps exhaust the patience of mature and reasonable people.

All plans for currency reform legislation recognize as a fact the political impossibility of securing the passage of any measure for reducing the weight of the treasury currency resting upon gold by the direct retirement of the greenbacks. If anything is accomplished in this regard, it will be accomplished in a roundabout way, and must be connected with the refunding of the present bonded debt contained under the extension of the national banking system.—E. V. Smalley.

The above is an extract from a letter written from Washington to the New York Evening Post. Its frank recognition of the "political impossibility" of retiring the present greenbacks by funding them into interest-bearing bonds should be imitated by the journal of which Mr. SMALLEY is the correspondent.

Is body keeping pace with mind?—Saratoga.

In the long-distance race it is. At times mind seems to be ahead, and at other times body. As we view the run along the whole line, which is far from straight and often rugged, we notice frequent gaps for mind, and about as many for body. In this generation of Americans mind and body seem to be keeping pace in a more orderly way than they kept it in some other generations. At the first, or away back in the days of the giants, and for a good while afterward, body took the lead; but this did not discourage mind, and the result was that as it got ready, the proper thing is for both mind and body to do their best. Rah, rah for mind! The same for body.

## STRAIGHT DEALING.

The Question of Confessing or Denying Adhesion to the Chicago Platform.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: As the discussion relating to the municipal election next fall progresses the condition of the Democrats of this city seems to be confusion worse confounded. Former Gov. Flower, speaking for himself and other gold Democrats some few weeks ago, declared that the gold Democrats were ready to aid Tammany Hall to elect its candidate for Mayor of Greater New York, but he distinctly stated that they could not do so if Tammany insisted on the Chicago platform.

It is not only Tammany who have aroused the Bryan Democrats to assume a more aggressive attitude. Instead of accepting the suggested compromise, the Bryan element insists that not only shall the Chicago platform be unequivocally indorsed, but that the person nominated for Mayor must be a pronounced Bryan man who will openly and boldly announce his adhesion to the principles of the Chicago platform. And, if they insist on this, the Bryanites further insist that all the candidates on the Tammany ticket must be avowedly of the same stamp. If these conditions are not complied with, they threaten to set up a ticket of their own or vote for the Citizens' Union ticket.

Confronted with this threat, the Tammany leaders, it is said, have secretly consented to comply with their demands.

It is well known that the Tammany leaders of the greatest influence in the organization are gold Democrats. By accepting the Chicago platform, they would be announcing their adhesion to the principles of the Chicago platform. Not even content with this, they are by this means intruding in power in Greater New York the principles of the Chicago platform. And, if they are to use that power to crush Bryanism, they are to use that power to crush Bryanism.

Such a course would not only be unfair and dishonest, but it would be a betrayal of the principles of the Chicago platform. It would be a betrayal of the principles of the Chicago platform. It would be a betrayal of the principles of the Chicago platform.

It is plain that they are attempting to hide behind the Chicago platform, and by doing so they are betraying the principles of the Chicago platform. They are betraying the principles of the Chicago platform. They are betraying the principles of the Chicago platform.

## TO OUST BRYAN!

A New Silver Programme for 1896.

From the Chicago Times Herald.

DENVER, June 6.—One hundred thousand dollars is being subscribed in Colorado, Montana, Utah, and Idaho, to maintain the free silver campaign. There is a determination on the part of the silver forces, which is assuming the leadership of the silver forces, to eliminate Mr. Bryan from the next Presidential race. A complete programme to that effect has been agreed upon by the Democratic leaders in the Senate and the so-called silver Republicans in both House and Senate. Their plan is to press the silver Republican organization in all parts of the Union—to make it as powerful as possible by the aid of the Legislature to make witnesses questioned by it answer, Judge DOSTER spoke contemptuously of "Government by injunction and government by habeas corpus and government by the courts," forms of inquiry which, he said, "are rapidly passing into accepted theories of municipal sovereignty." The "virus" of these theories "has so inoculated the body politic as to endanger the very life of the organized political system." Then Judge DOSTER mentioned the fact that even in Kansas "only four years ago a majority of the Judges of this court assumed the right to compose a legislative dispute as to one of the houses, and this not upon any theory of constitutional interpretation, but by the might of forces drawn out of that vast and cavernous reservoir of authority called judicial power."

The danger that the courts may check the activity of crank Legislatures engaged in regulating things in general without regard to the Constitution, common sense, or common justice, must seem very serious to the Populist. Judge DOSTER, however, has a Populist Supreme Court, and no undue interference with the energies of the Legislature will be permitted. Yet as long as "that vast and cavernous reservoir of authority called judicial power" can be drawn upon by courts, which are not under Populist control, Populist statesmen cannot be sure that they will not be drowned by the outflow. Law and Populist-made laws must be irreconcilable opposites. Would it not be better to seal up the vast and cavernous reservoir? Legislative power is the one necessary and final power. Why then have courts, which are often impudently careless of the holy zeal of Legislatures, to reform the world? Why not shut up the courts for good?

Millions of dollars were said to be waiting on the shelves of the institution for the use of the candidate for Postmaster at that place, was in town to-day.

Some of them are being invested; some of them are waiting for the passage of the Tariff bill; and more are still too timid to risk enterprise while the Bryanite connection is haunting for wealth like tigers with vultures that they will have it for their own.

What is the issue which will prevent this party division? That of simple good government. The candidate who shall stand for that issue, the issue that he can be neither misunderstood nor misinterpreted is the only one who can hope to win against Tammany.—Bretnig News.

Of course it will be the issue, dear boy. It is the issue of every election and the only issue, whether the election be municipal, State, or Federal, here or anywhere else. The divisions of politics are made solely by differences of opinion as to what "good government" is.

From the Salvation.

From the Salvation.

From the Salvation.

From the Salvation.

## COL. MICHELL'S MEDAL.

Portrait of a Soldier, a Soldier's Wife, and a Soldier's Child.

During a stormy night in the winter of 1862, while Col. Harry W. Michell of Brooklyn, then a First Lieutenant in the Fourteenth Regiment, was on the skirmish line in Virginia, he lost a medal which had been presented to him by his company. It was of the Maltese cross pattern,